

**REMARKS**

Claims 21-26 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action mailed February 23, 2005, the Examiner maintained a §112, paragraph one rejection from the prior office communication. Applicant notes with appreciation that all other objections and rejections were removed.

For the reasons provided in the Amendment and Response filed on November 15, 2004, and incorporated herein by reference, Applicant maintains that the unamended claims are enabled under §112, paragraph one in that no claim is made to particular efficacy or effect of active idiotypé immunotherapy. Nonetheless, for business reasons and without acquiescing to the Examiner's arguments, Claims 21, 22 and 23 have been amended to remove the term "active idiotypé immunotherapy" and Claim 21 has been amended to recite administering a multivalent composition to a subject to invoke an immune response.

Applicant claims a method of administering a multivalent composition to a subject, the multivalent composition being derived from the subject's lymphoma cells. As acknowledged by the Examiner in the previous communication, (Office Action mailed February 23, 2005 at page 3), the Applicant has enabled the construction of the compositions used in the claimed method, and has enabled the administration of the compositions. Administration of compositions to invoke an immune response is known in the art. See, *e.g.*, the specification at page 82, lines 26-27. The Examiner has acknowledged that the specification provides sufficient detail to enable one of skill in the art to use the method of administration of the claimed invention for uses such as conducting research (Office Action mailed February 23, 2005 at page 3). As such, the specification provides sufficient written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, commensurate in scope to the claims, and the requirements of §112, first paragraph are satisfied. Applicant therefore respectfully request that this rejection be removed.

**CONCLUSION**

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all grounds for rejection have been addressed and should be removed, and that Applicant's claims should be passed to allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would aid in the prosecution of this application, Applicant encourages the Examiner to call the undersigned collect at (608) 218-6900.

Dated: April 25, 2005



Mary Ann D. Brow  
Registration No. 42,363  
MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP  
101 Howard Street, Suite 350  
San Francisco, California 94105